

## ***REMARKS***

The paragraphs of the office action are responded to through the numbered paragraphs below. The applicant has addressed each issue in turn and for clarity has provided a heading for each issue.

### ***Drawings***

1. The Examiner objected to the drawings "because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the specification: 101a (figs 1, 3 and 5-6), 101b (figs 1 and 4-6) and 401 (fig 4)." The applicant has requested that paragraph 55 be amended to include the reference signs 101a and 101b and applicant has requested that figure 4 be replaced with the corrected drawing deleting the reference to 401. The applicant believes that no new material has been added in this requested amendment. The applicant believes that these requested amendments are fully responsive to the objections of this paragraph. The applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these objections.
2. The Examiner objected to the drawings "because reference character '116b' has been used to designate both drive belt (paragraph 55) and gear belt (paragraph 58)." The applicant has requested that paragraph 58 be amended to conform the description of 116b. The applicant believes that no new material has been added in this requested amendment. The applicant believes that these requested amendments are fully responsive to the objections of this paragraph. The applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

### ***Specification***

3. The Examiner objected to the disclosure because of the following informalities:

Paragraph 1, '6Field' should be replaced with 'Field'.

Paragraph 38, 'through he' should be replaced with 'through the'.

Paragraph 55, 'the gear motor 501' should be replaced with 'a gear motor 501'.

'to the rear frame 118' should be replaced with 'to a rear frame 118'.

Paragraph 60, 'the alternator 601' should be replaced with 'an alternator 601'.

Paragraph 62, '18A' should be replaced with 'A'.

The applicant has requested that paragraphs 1, 38, 55, 60 and 62 be amended as suggested by the Examiner. The applicant believes that no new material has been added in these requested amendments. The applicant believes that these requested amendments are fully responsive to the objections of this paragraph. The applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these objections.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112***

4. The Examiner provided the citation to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The applicant believes that no response is required for this paragraph.
5. The Examiner rejected claims 2-7 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The applicant has requested that each rejected claim be amended to address the rejections of this paragraph. The applicant believes that the requested amendments fully address the rejections of this paragraph. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of this paragraph.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

6. The Examiner provided the citation to 35 U.S.C. § 102 "that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action". The applicant believes that no response is required for this paragraph.
7. The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6 and 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Thatcher et al. The applicant has requested that claim 1, on which claims 2-4, 6 and 8-13 depend, be amended to more clearly point out that additional components and structure of the first scrubber and the buffer. The applicant believes that invention as claimed in the amended claim 1 is not described or suggested in the cited reference. The applicant believes that this amendment is fully responsive to the rejection of this paragraph. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

8. The Examiner provided the citation to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Applicant believes that no response is required for this paragraph.
9. The Examiner provided a review of some of the factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.* that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Examiner also noted that the application names joint inventors and reminded the applicant of the obligation to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made. The applicant believes all claims were and remain commonly owned.

10. The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thatcher et al. in view of Nagayama et al. The applicant has requested that claim 1, on which both claims 5 and 7 depend, be amended to more clearly point out additional elements and structure of the scrubber and buffer of this invention. The applicant believes that applicant's invention as described in the amended claims and therefore by claims dependent on amended claims is neither described nor suggested by the cited references either along or in combination. The applicant believes that the requested amendments fully address the rejections of this paragraph. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.
11. The Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thatcher et al. The applicant has requested that claim 1, on which claim 14 depends, be amended to more clearly point out that additional elements and structure of the scrubber and buffer of this invention. The applicant believes that applicant's invention as described in the amended claims and therefore by claims dependent on amended claims is neither described nor suggested by the cited references either along or in combination. The applicant believes that the requested amendments fully address the rejections of this paragraph. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

12. The Examiner indicated that certain "prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure." The applicant appreciates the Examiner's search and respectfully requests that these documents be included in


the cited references in this case.

13. The Examiner provided information concerning communication on this case. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's willingness to communicate on this case and believes that no specific response is required for this paragraph.

Applicant has requested that claims 1-14 be amended as previously described. In view of the foregoing, and in summary, the applicant believes that all issues and points of the Examiner's Office action have been addressed. The applicant believes that the newly amended claims (claims 1-14) are patentable over the prior art.

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of October, 2002.



Lloyd W. Sadler, Reg. No. 40, 154  
PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER  
201 South Main Street, Suite 1800  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
Telephone: (801)532-1234  
Facsimile: (801)536-6111